

Composition-dependent long range forces from varying m_p/m_e

Thomas Dent^{*}

Theoretische Physik, 16 Philosophenweg, Heidelberg 69120 GERMANY

February 2, 2008

Abstract

We relate possible cosmological variations in the mass ratio $\mu \equiv m_p/m_e$ and the fine structure constant α to long-range composition-dependent forces mediated by a scalar field. The differential acceleration η in Eötvös-type experiments is bounded below by 10^{-14} , except in cases where one or more scalar couplings vanish. We consider what values for these couplings could arise from unified theories. By considering the contribution of the scalar field to the cosmological energy density we use bounds on η to put upper bounds on the current rate of change of μ and α .

1 Introduction

The constancy of the coupling strengths and particle masses in the Standard Model Lagrangian is an assumption that should be tested. If a variation existed it would violate the principle of Local Position Invariance contained in the Einstein equivalence principle. Nevertheless consistent, relativistically covariant theories with varying couplings can be written down by including scalar degrees of freedom, in which the variation arises due to the cosmological solution for the scalar(s). See for example [16, 17, 21, 38].

There are also many situations in cosmology where gravitational effects appear to behave differently from what a naive application of GR would produce, which may also motivate the existence of cosmological scalar fields. The first is inflation (see for example [10]), which seems to require a scalar field with a peculiar kind of potential. Closely related, though happening on an immensely slower timescale, is the current apparent accelerated expansion of the Universe [11, 10], which may also be related to scalar field dynamics [12, 21].

The violation of the Einstein equivalence principle makes itself via scalar mediated forces, thus gravity becomes a generalised scalar-tensor theory. So far, precision tests of gravity have revealed no deviation from General Relativity [31, 22], in particular concerning the question we will discuss here, the equivalence of gravitational and inertial mass (universality of free fall) [7]. The motivation for continuing to consider deviations from GR then comes into question.

^{*}email: dent@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

The current motivation comes from astrophysical measurements of various coupling strengths and mass ratios deduced from atomic and molecular absorption (or emission) wavelengths. These probe back to redshifts up to about 4 and have now reached the sensitivity of 10^{-5} or better; moreover some measurements of the fine structure constant α [1], and most recently the proton-electron mass ratio $\mu \equiv m_p/m_e$ [2] show potentially significant deviations. The fine structure constant has been the subject of debate, with other recent studies obtaining negative results [3, 4], some at a precision greater than or equal to previous evidence for variation.

Bounds on variation of α from nuclear physics effects [8, 9] have also been derived; however they are subject to considerable uncertainty if one also allows other quantities such as quark masses to vary (see for example [29]).

It was pointed out in [15] that a fractional variation of α on the order of 10^{-5} required a scalar coupling to electromagnetic energy large enough such that the differential acceleration of two bodies in the gravitational field of the Sun (including scalar forces) is of order 10^{-18} , which may be detectable with the STEP experiment. A more detailed analysis of scalar field models in [17], including also the electrostatic energy of nuclei, found a rather more restrictive bound from non-universal free fall, generally referred to as Weak Equivalence Principle (WEP) violation, although. Other works have related a variation in α to scalar field models which describe the current acceleration of the Universe [18, 19, 20].

As pointed out in [21], one reason for believing the result of [15] to be an underestimate of WEP violation is that the authors did not include possible scalar couplings to other Standard Model sectors which are likely in unified models (see also [23, 24, 25, 27, 26, 28]). Clearly also a scalar coupling to electromagnetism alone cannot produce a variation in μ at the same level as that in α .

Hence in this paper we redo and extend the analysis to include other possible types of scalar coupling through which varying α and μ can be related to WEP violation. Current limits on differential gravitational acceleration are at the level of $10^{-12} - 10^{-13}$ [7] for the parameter η defined as

$$\eta \equiv 2 \frac{|a_1 - a_2|}{|a_1 + a_2|} \quad (1)$$

where two test bodies of different composition have accelerations a_1, a_2 towards a known gravitational source.

In the first section of the paper we make a preliminary estimate of the size of differential acceleration η due to ϕ -mediated forces, allowing for varying μ , and find it may be orders of magnitude greater than 10^{-18} , and possibly visible with the MICROSCOPE experiment with sensitivity 10^{-15} . Exceptions occur if some scalar couplings vanish exactly.

In the second section we consider what scalar couplings consistent with varying μ may emerge from unified models both with and without supersymmetry, using the detailed analysis of [28]. We find it unlikely that the scalar coupling to any particle will vanish. In fact some unification scenarios imply that WEP violation may be at the current limits of detection, or even be ruled out by

Eötvös-type experiments. Only a restricted range of unified scenarios can be consistent with reported variations of α and μ , if these are to arise from a scalar field varying over cosmological time.

In the last section we examine the cosmological evolution of the scalar field in more detail and suggest a direct test of unified scenarios by comparing WEP violation with atomic clock measurements of the constancy of fundamental parameters.

1.1 Consistency of “varying constant” observations

Clearly, the experimental situation on possible variation of α is currently unsatisfactory, while that for μ requires further independent testing. We discuss two points: first, whether nonzero variations in both α and μ are inconsistent with other measurements of dimensionless fundamental quantities; second, whether recent results on α are directly comparable.

The quantities $y \equiv \alpha^2 g_p$ and $x \equiv \alpha^2 g_p m_e/m_p$ have been measured with good precision using quasar absorption [5, 6]. From two systems at redshifts below 0.7 the fractional variation of y is bounded at the level of 5×10^{-6} , hence is not inconsistent with the claim $\Delta\alpha = (-0.57 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-5}$ (made for systems over a wide range in redshift) given constant g_p .¹ The result for x indicates a slight but not significant *increase* into the past, $\Delta x/x = (1.2 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-5}$. Again given constant g_p , this is difficult to reconcile with a decrease in α and an increase in μ as claimed in [2] at the level $\Delta\mu/\mu = (2.4 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-5}$. Hence we cannot assume that both α and μ have exactly the claimed nonzero variation. Rather we will make estimates assuming that at least one nonzero variation exists (usually μ) at the claimed level.

The most recent negative results for $\Delta\alpha$ are based on very few absorption systems, the improved sensitivity being ascribed to more accurate spectroscopy. The Webb group results by contrast involve a sample of about 150 systems.² This makes it possible to compare the estimated error in each system statistical scatter over the sample, and carry out checks against systematic error. One outstanding question is the statistical error due to fitting the velocity profile of the absorbing system; see for example the first reference of [4]. It may require a large number of systems to be analyzed to settle the question.

2 Preliminary estimate of η

The estimate proceeds along the same lines as [15], but with some important differences. In particular the electron content of matter must be explicitly included since the variation of μ involves m_e .

We posit a light neutral scalar field ϕ which is canonically normalised, redefining the origin such that the value of ϕ vanishes today, and work in the Einstein frame. It will be convenient to use a dimensionless scalar $\bar{\phi} \equiv \phi/\bar{M}_P$

¹Possible variation of g -factors was discussed in [30]; any effect on g_p is expected to be small.

²Analysis of more recent observations is ongoing (M. Murphy, private communication).

where $\bar{M}_P$ is the reduced Planck mass $(8\pi G)^{-1/2}$. The scalar couples to matter in the low momentum limit via effective operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{\phi m} = -m_{e,0} [1 + \lambda_e \bar{\phi}] \bar{e}e - m_{p,0} [1 + \lambda_p \bar{\phi}] \bar{p}p - m_{n,0} [1 + \lambda_n \bar{\phi}] \bar{n}n \quad (2)$$

where $m_{e,0}$ *etc.*, are the present-day values of particle masses, and to electromagnetism via

$$\mathcal{L}_{\phi em} = -\frac{1}{4} [1 + \lambda_{em} \bar{\phi}]^{-1} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \quad (3)$$

thus the fine structure constant is given by $\alpha = \alpha_0(1 + \lambda_{em} \bar{\phi})$. Note that λ_p and λ_n can differ from one another only due to light quark masses and electromagnetic effects, *i.e.* isospin violation. We may reexpress the nucleon mass terms as

$$m_N [1 + \lambda_i \bar{\phi}] (\bar{p}p + \bar{n}n) + \frac{m_N}{2} \left[\frac{\delta m_{np}}{m_N} + \lambda_v \bar{\phi} \right] (-\bar{p}p + \bar{n}n) \quad (4)$$

where m_N is an averaged nucleon mass (we drop the “0” suffix except in case of ambiguity), δm_{np} is the nucleon mass difference and

$$\lambda_i \equiv \frac{\lambda_p m_p + \lambda_n m_n}{m_N}, \quad \lambda_v \equiv \frac{-\lambda_p m_p + \lambda_n m_n}{m_N}.$$

Note that this form gives only the leading linear dependence on $\bar{\phi}$. We could be more general and replace λ_e and other couplings with general functions $\lambda_e(\bar{\phi})$ (etc.) defined via

$$\frac{\partial \ln(m_e/M_P)}{\partial \bar{\phi}} \equiv \lambda_e(\bar{\phi})$$

allowing a nonlinear dependence, which may be likely if the value of $\bar{\phi}$ changes by more than a small fraction.

For a given test object we have $n_e = n_p$ electrons and protons and n_n neutrons, with the “proton fraction” f_p defined as $n_p/(n_p + n_n)$, equal to the mass averaged value of Z/A , and “neutron fraction” $f_n \equiv 1 - f_p$. The nuclear electromagnetic binding energy also makes a contribution $f_{em} m_N Z(Z-1)A^{-1/3}$ to the mass, where $f_{em} \simeq 7 \times 10^{-4}$. The ratio of the ϕ -mediated acceleration of a test body a_ϕ to the gravitational acceleration a_{gr} is then

$$\frac{a_\phi}{a_{gr}} = \left(\frac{f_p^s (\lambda_e m_e + \lambda_p m_p) + f_n^s \lambda_n m_n}{m_N} + f_{em} \lambda_{em} \frac{\langle Z(Z-1)A^{-1/3} \rangle^s}{\langle A \rangle^s} \right) \times \left(\frac{f_p (\lambda_e m_e + \lambda_p m_p) + f_n \lambda_n m_n}{m_N} + f_{em} \lambda_{em} \frac{\langle Z(Z-1)A^{-1/3} \rangle}{\langle A \rangle} \right) \quad (5)$$

where the superscript s refers to the common source. If, as in some experiments, this is the Sun then the electromagnetic contribution to the source coupling is negligible. Note that if electrons are in relativistic motion their scalar charge is “diluted” by a boost factor, as derived for example in [38], but to obtain conservative bounds on scalar couplings we will take the nonrelativistic limit.

For two test bodies possessing different f_p , Z and A one can determine the ratio

$$\eta \simeq \frac{|a_{\phi,1} - a_{\phi,2}|}{a_{gr}} \quad (6)$$

where $a_\phi \ll a_{gr}$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &\simeq \left(f_p^s \left[\lambda_e \frac{m_e}{m_N} + \lambda_p \right] + f_n^s \lambda_n + \lambda_{em} f_{em} \frac{\langle Z(Z-1)A^{-1/3} \rangle^s}{\langle A \rangle^s} \right) \times \\ &\quad \left(\left[\lambda_e \frac{m_e}{m_N} + \lambda_p \frac{m_p}{m_N} - \lambda_n \frac{m_n}{m_N} \right] \Delta_{12} f_p + \lambda_{em} f_{em} \Delta_{12} \frac{\langle Z^2 A^{-1/3} \rangle}{\langle A \rangle} \right) \\ &\simeq \left(\frac{\lambda_e}{1837} + \frac{\lambda_i}{2} - \frac{\lambda_v}{2} \right) \left(\left[\frac{\lambda_e}{1837} - \lambda_v \right] \Delta_{12} f_p + \lambda_{em} f_{em} \Delta_{12} \frac{\langle Z^2 A^{-1/3} \rangle}{\langle A \rangle} \right) \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

where the notation Δ_{12} denotes the difference between the two test bodies and we take them to have $Z \gg 1$. The last line of Eq. (7) follows since we find the strongest bound from an experiment using “Earth-like” (mostly iron) and “Moon-like” (mostly silica) test bodies accelerating towards the Sun, for which $f_p^s \simeq 1$; the test bodies differ by $\Delta_{12} f_p = 0.036$ and $\Delta_{12} (\langle Z^2 A^{-1/3} \rangle / \langle A \rangle) \simeq -1.0$.

There are different possibilities for an evolving value of ϕ to produce a variation in μ . If the variation is entirely due to the isospin-conserving coupling λ_i then the differential acceleration vanishes, but in general one expects all couplings to be nonzero. (Variation of α also implies that λ_v and λ_{em} are nonvanishing.) We require $(\lambda_p - \lambda_e) \Delta \bar{\phi}$ to be of order 10^{-5} , where the change $\Delta \phi$ occurs between redshifts 2 to 3 and the present. If we have a nonlinear dependence of particle masses and α on ϕ then the functions $\lambda_e(\bar{\phi})$ *etc.* must be integrated back to the value $\bar{\phi}_1$ at redshift 2 to 3 and we obtain instead averaged values

$$\bar{\lambda}_e = \frac{1}{\Delta \bar{\phi}} \int_{\bar{\phi}_0}^{\bar{\phi}_1} d\bar{\phi} \lambda_e(\bar{\phi})$$

(where we earlier fixed $\bar{\phi}_0 = 0$). In terms of the isospin conserving and violating ϕ couplings we have

$$\Delta \ln \mu = \left(\lambda_i - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_v - \lambda_e \right) \Delta \bar{\phi} \quad (8)$$

If ϕ is not evolving fast, $\Delta \bar{\phi} \lesssim 1$ then at least one of these coupling constants should be of magnitude 10^{-5} or greater.

If as in [38] the variation of μ is entirely due to the electron coupling then η will be at least 10^{-18} . However, if both λ_i and λ_e are of order 10^{-5} then the lower bound on η becomes much larger, a few times 10^{-15} . If λ_i happens to vanish, then the value of η will depend on the relation between λ_v , λ_e and λ_{em} . The contribution of electromagnetic self-energy to the proton mass (which enters via λ_v) is tiny and cannot lead to observable changes in μ , therefore λ_{em} is bounded only by measurements of α . If we take a variation $\Delta \alpha / \alpha = 0.6 \times 10^{-5}$

then the contribution of λ_{em} to η is about an order of magnitude larger than that of λ_e , comparing $0.036\lambda_e/1837$ with $7 \times 10^{-4}\lambda_{em}$, where λ_e is chosen to give $\Delta\mu/\mu$ of a few times 10^{-5} .

3 Scalar couplings in unified models

In the previous discussion we ignored the underlying physics which should lead to relations between the scalar coupling strengths λ_i , λ_v , λ_e and λ_{em} . In particular the isospin-violating coupling λ_v can only arise from the coupling of ϕ to up and down quark masses or electromagnetic self-energy. Now recall that the ratio m_q/M_P , where M_P is the Planck mass, is mainly due to the hierarchically small value of the Higgs v.e.v. v/M_P , which is equally true of the electron mass: hence even without invoking unification it seems very likely that the functional dependence of $m_{u,d}/M_P$ on ϕ will mirror that of m_e/M_P . Symbolically

$$\partial_\phi \ln \frac{m_q}{M_P} \simeq \partial_\phi \ln \frac{m_e}{M_P} \Rightarrow \lambda_{u,d} \simeq \lambda_e. \quad (9)$$

Now the contribution of $m_d - m_u$ to δm_{np} is a few MeV, hence the value of λ_v is suppressed by the ratio $(m_d - m_u)/m_N$, relative to the quark couplings, and its contribution to η will likely be comparable to that of λ_e .

To be more systematic, we note the following relations valid for small variations in particle masses:

$$\Delta \ln \frac{m_N}{M_P} = \lambda_i \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \frac{\delta m_{np}}{M_P} = \frac{m_N}{\delta m_{np}} \lambda_v \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \frac{m_e}{M_P} = \lambda_e \Delta \bar{\phi} \quad (10)$$

which will allow us to connect these low-energy quantities to underlying couplings of the cosmon. We choose to look at models with unification of gauge couplings in which the cosmon may couple to four quantities: the unification mass M_X , the unified fine structure constant α_X defined at the scale M_X , the Higgs v.e.v. v , and (for supersymmetric theories) the soft supersymmetry-breaking masses $\tilde{m}$, which enter as thresholds in the RG evolution equations. Their variations are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \frac{M_X}{M_P} &= \lambda_M \Delta \bar{\phi}, & \Delta \ln \alpha_X &= \lambda_X \Delta \bar{\phi}, \\ \Delta \ln \frac{v}{M_X} &= \lambda_H \Delta \bar{\phi}, & \Delta \ln \frac{\tilde{m}}{M_X} &= \lambda_S \Delta \bar{\phi} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and in nonsupersymmetric theories we set $\lambda_S = 0$. The results of [28] can now be used to relate the nucleon and electron masses to the underlying quantities. The electron mass varies as

$$\Delta \ln \frac{m_e}{M_P} = \lambda_M + \lambda_H \Delta \bar{\phi} \quad (12)$$

thus simply $\lambda_e = \lambda_M + \lambda_H$; the same is true for the quark masses (neglecting the variation of Yukawa coupling constants). As an intermediate result we require the variation of the QCD scale Λ_c which satisfies

$$\Delta \ln \frac{\Lambda_c}{M_X} \equiv \lambda_\Lambda \Delta \bar{\phi} = \left(\frac{2\pi}{9\alpha_X} \lambda_X + \frac{2}{9} \lambda_H + \frac{4}{9} \lambda_S \right) \Delta \bar{\phi} \quad (13)$$

and the variation of α given by

$$\Delta \ln \alpha \equiv \lambda_{em} \Delta \bar{\phi} \simeq \left\{ \frac{8\alpha}{3\alpha_X} \lambda_X + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \left(\frac{8}{3} \lambda_\Lambda + \lambda_H + \frac{25}{3} \lambda_S \right) \right\} \Delta \bar{\phi}. \quad (14)$$

Then the averaged nucleon mass coupling is

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_M + \frac{0.54}{\alpha_X} \lambda_X + (0.39 \pm 0.12) \lambda_H + 0.35 \lambda_S \quad (15)$$

where light quark mass contributions, heavy quark and superpartner thresholds are accounted for; the uncertainty in the λ_H term arises from the strangeness content (see for example [40]). The isospin violating coupling is found from the expression

$$\delta m_{np} = \left[2.05 \left(1 + \Delta \ln \frac{m_d - m_u}{M_P} \right) - 0.76 \left(1 + \Delta \ln \alpha + \Delta \ln \frac{\Lambda_c}{M_P} \right) \right] \text{MeV} \quad (16)$$

with coefficients derived from [39]; this leads to

$$\lambda_v \simeq 1.4 \times 10^{-3} [\lambda_M - 10.2 \lambda_X + 1.46 \lambda_H - 0.27 \lambda_S] \quad (17)$$

where we take $\alpha_X^{-1} \simeq 24$. Note that the contribution of varying α to this mass splitting is always very small compared to that of Λ_c which is much more sensitive to the underlying parameters. We see immediately that the contribution of λ_v to the variation of μ is negligible; we have

$$\Delta \ln \mu \simeq [13.0 \lambda_X - (0.61 \pm 0.12) \lambda_H + 0.35 \lambda_S] \Delta \bar{\phi}. \quad (18)$$

We can now for a range of unified models determine the relations between variations of μ and α and the low-energy coupling constants that give rise to differential accelerations. We ignore λ_M since this coupling does not affect either α or μ .

Scenario 1: varying unified coupling We first consider the case when only λ_X is nonvanishing, among the underlying cosmon couplings. Then we have

$$\Delta \ln \alpha \simeq 0.52 \lambda_X \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \mu \simeq 13 \lambda_X \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad (19)$$

$$\lambda_e = 0, \quad \lambda_i = 13 \lambda_X, \quad \lambda_v = (-1.4 \times 10^{-2}) \lambda_X \quad (20)$$

thus $\Delta \ln \mu \simeq 25 \Delta \ln \alpha$ (which would put the variation of α beyond the reach of current observations). The magnitude of λ_X is at least of order 10^{-6} , to produce a nonzero variation of μ . Now the differential acceleration arises from the product $\lambda_i \lambda_v / 2$ which is at least 10^{-13} , leading to η of magnitude just below 10^{-14} ; the contribution proportional to λ_{em} is slightly smaller.

Scenario 2: varying Higgs v.e.v. without SUSY Next we consider if the variation were to arise solely from a change in the Higgs v.e.v. relative to the unified scale, thus λ_H is nonzero. Then we have

$$\Delta \ln \alpha \simeq (2 \times 10^{-3}) \lambda_H \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \mu \simeq -0.6 \lambda_H \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad (21)$$

$$\lambda_e = \lambda_H, \quad \lambda_i \simeq 0.4 \lambda_H, \quad \lambda_v = 2 \times 10^{-3} \lambda_H \quad (22)$$

In this case the fractional variation of α should be about 300 times smaller than that of μ ! Now to reproduce a nonzero variation of μ we require λ_H to be a few times 10^{-5} and $\lambda_i \lambda_v / 2$ is again at the level of 10^{-13} , with the electron contribution $\lambda_i \lambda_e / (2 \cdot 1837)$ only slightly smaller. Again η is bounded below by 10^{-14} , given a nonzero variation of μ .

Scenario 3: variation of SUSY-breaking hidden sector and Higgs v.e.v. Next we consider what happens if supersymmetry-breaking arises from a hidden sector with a mass scale that is generated by gauge dynamics, and assume that electroweak symmetry breaking is triggered by soft SUSY-breaking masses. We will first take the hidden sector gauge coupling to vary independently of the visible sector gauge couplings, thus

$$\lambda_X = 0, \quad \lambda_S \simeq \lambda_H. \quad (23)$$

Then we find

$$\Delta \ln \mu = (-0.3 \pm 0.1) \lambda_S \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \alpha = (1.3 \times 10^{-2}) \lambda_S \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad (24)$$

$$\lambda_e \simeq \lambda_S, \quad \lambda_i \simeq 0.74 \lambda_S, \quad \lambda_v = 1.7 \times 10^{-3} \lambda_S, \quad (25)$$

with λ_S being at least 10^{-4} to produce a variation of μ at the observed level. Here the fractional variation of α should be about 20 times smaller than that of μ and of *opposite* sign. Then the product $\lambda_i \lambda_v / 2$ is at least a few times 10^{-12} and η must reach the level of 10^{-13} level, pushing current observational limits. The λ_e and λ_{em} contributions are slightly smaller.

Scenario 4: varying unified coupling plus SUSY-breaking Finally we consider what may happen if the hidden sector gauge coupling varies with the unified coupling at the fundamental scale. As first pointed out in [25] this leads to the relations

$$\lambda_S \simeq \lambda_H \simeq 34 \lambda_X. \quad (26)$$

This results [28] in $\Delta \ln \mu$ being of the same magnitude as $\Delta \ln \alpha$. More concretely

$$\Delta \ln \mu = (4 \pm 4) \lambda_X \Delta \bar{\phi}, \quad \Delta \ln \alpha \simeq 1.0 \lambda_X \Delta \bar{\phi} \quad (27)$$

thus λ_X is just below 10^{-5} , or larger, to match the claimed nonzero variations. We then find

$$\lambda_e \simeq 34 \lambda_X, \quad \lambda_i \simeq 38 \lambda_X, \quad \lambda_v \simeq (4 \times 10^{-2}) \lambda_X, \quad (28)$$

thus the products of couplings appearing in η are a few times 10^{-11} , leading to differential accelerations of order 10^{-12} , already outside the experimental range!

This comes about because the variations of m_p/M_P and m_e/M_P are large but cancel against one another in μ ; however the differential accelerations due to the nucleon mass splitting, the electron mass and the nuclear electromagnetic energy do not in general cancel against each other. The contributions from λ_e and λ_{em} are slightly smaller than those from λ_v , and may have opposite sign, but even if they did cancel in one Eötvös-type experiment this could not hold in other setups where source and test bodies had different values of Z and A . This scenario could only survive if the variations of α and μ were below currently claimed nonzero values.

One can also consider a non-SUSY GUT scenario where the unification mass scale and coupling are $M_X \simeq 10^{15}$ GeV and $\alpha_X^{-1} \simeq 40$, where the electroweak scale would arise from some technicolor-like sector, giving $\lambda_H = (31 \pm 2)\lambda_X$ if the technicolor group is unified with the Standard Model. The results for this type of model are in fact very close to Scenario 3. There is a cancellation in the (fractional) variation of μ such that is comparable to the variation of α , however the scalar couplings are relatively large and η is of order 10^{-12} .

Models where there is a partial cancellation between variations of m_e/M_X and m_p/M_X have been put forward in [28] and the last reference of [24], as a way of reconciling the claimed nonzero variations of α and μ which are incompatible in many simple unified theories. However, these estimates of WEP violation show that such models are likely to have problems to respect current experimental bounds.

Simplified expression for WEP *vs.* varying μ We have seen that in all these scenarios based on unification the source factor (first bracket) in Eq. (7) is strongly dominated by the isospin-conserving scalar coupling λ_i , while the second factor depends on the electron coupling, the isospin-violating coupling λ_v and the electromagnetic coupling λ_{em} . The isospin-violating contribution to $\Delta \ln \mu$ in Eq. (8) is negligible. Therefore the relation between the variation of μ and the differential acceleration η can be simplified to

$$\frac{\eta}{(\Delta \ln \mu)^2} \gtrsim \frac{\lambda_i}{2(\lambda_i - \lambda_e)^2} \left(\left[\frac{\lambda_e}{1837} - \lambda_v \right] \Delta_{12} f_p + 7 \times 10^{-4} \lambda_{em} \Delta_{12} \frac{\langle Z^2 A^{-1/3} \rangle}{\langle A \rangle} \right) \quad (29)$$

due to the fact that all scalar couplings arise from one underlying parameter whose variation, for any given $\Delta \ln \mu$, is proportional to $(\lambda_i - \lambda_e)^{-1}$.

4 Evolution of the cosmon or quintessence field

Since the estimates of the previous section are interestingly close to the current experimental limit of η , and we made only rough estimates using the assumption that $\Delta \bar{\phi}$ was less than unity, we will refine them by examining in more detail the cosmological evolution of ϕ and applying constraints on its kinetic energy

density. In previous work [21] a physical model was adopted with an exponential potential and a general (non-canonical) kinetic term allowing the past evolution of the field to be found in terms of a few parameters. However in general the evolution and variation of “constants” may depend on undetermined *functions* of a scalar field, either in the scalar action (kinetic terms plus potential) or its couplings to matter.

Another question is whether the evolution is homogeneous, that is, whether the scalar value depends only on cosmological time, or is position- or environment-dependent. This question was investigated for gravitationally collapsing regions of spacetime in [32] and more recently for virialized structures in [33], where the result was found that the rate of change of ϕ is the same within virialized regions as in the background and the value of the field depends only weakly on position, a result also obtained in [34, 35] (confirming the analysis of [21]). However, note that if a scalar field couples strongly to matter such that its expectation value and mass are determined by the local density, both the cosmological evolution and the possible scalar-mediated forces behave quite differently [36, 37]. It has been claimed that such a “chameleon” field cannot give rise to a fractional variation of α at the 10^{-5} level, but that bound may be due to particular choices made in setting up the model of [36], rather than a general result. We will consider here only the weak coupling regime where the mass of the scalar field is determined primarily by its potential $V(\phi)$.

4.1 Relating WEP violation to atomic clock measurements

The ϕ couplings to matter can be related most directly to the *present* rate of change of dimensionless couplings, which we now derive. For a canonically normalized scalar field we have kinetic energy $T = (1/2)\dot{\phi}^2$ and a potential $V(\phi)$, resulting in the energy density $\rho_\phi = T + V$ and equation of state $w_\phi = (T - V)/(T + V)$. There may also be contributions to the scalar equation of motion from interactions with matter, dark matter *etc.* and as shown for example in [36] these may alter the effective equation of state to be less negative. However we do not expect such contributions to greatly affect our bound, which is derived from the maximum kinetic energy of ϕ consistent with observation and does not depend strongly on w_ϕ .

The energy density fraction Ω_ϕ is defined as $\rho_\phi/\rho_c \equiv \rho_\phi/3H^2\bar{M}_P^2$. Hence we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{\phi}}{H} = \sqrt{3\Omega_\phi(1 + w_\phi)}. \quad (30)$$

The usefulness of this equation is that the Hubble constant is now well measured whilst the quantities inside the square root on the RHS are bounded above. Given current cosmological observations, there is an allowed region in the Ω_ϕ - w_ϕ plane inside which Eq. (30) attains a maximum value, which we can estimate roughly as $\sqrt{3} \times 0.75 \times 0.2 \simeq 0.7$. Using $H_0 \simeq 7 \times 10^{-11} \text{y}^{-1}$ we find

$$\dot{\phi} \leq \dot{\phi}_{\text{max}} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{y}^{-1}. \quad (31)$$

For a given unified model where all varying quantities are determined by a

single parameter λ we can write

$$\frac{\dot{\alpha}}{\alpha} \leq c_1 \lambda \dot{\phi}_{\max}, \quad \frac{\dot{\mu}}{\mu} \leq c_2 \lambda \dot{\phi}_{\max}, \quad (32)$$

where the numerical constants c_1 and c_2 arise from relations detailed in the previous section. Similarly the results for η can be summarized in the form

$$\eta = K \frac{\Delta_{12} f_p}{2} \lambda^2 \quad (33)$$

for some constant K , where for simplicity we omit the contribution of nuclear electromagnetic energy which was subdominant in all the scenarios considered.³ Thus we find

$$\eta \geq \frac{\Delta_{12} f_p}{2 \dot{\phi}_{\max}^2} \frac{K}{c_2^2} \left(\frac{\dot{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^2 \simeq \frac{K}{c_2^2} \left(\frac{\dot{\mu}/\mu}{3.7 \times 10^{-10} y^{-1}} \right)^2 \quad (34)$$

taking $\Delta_{12} f_p$ to be 0.036 as before. An exactly analogous inequality follows by replacing μ with α and c_2 with c_1 .

Now if we suppose that $\dot{\alpha}$ or $\dot{\mu}$ are nonzero at present (either due to direct measurement or to a particular model of cosmological evolution) then in any given scenario of unification we find the values of K/c_1^2 and K/c_2^2 and obtain the lower bound on η .

Conversely, given bounds on η , for any given unification scenario we can obtain bounds on $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha$ and $\dot{\mu}/\mu$ which must be satisfied for a cosmological variation arising from a scalar field effective action. These may be directly compared with atomic clock measurements. Note that a nonzero result for η , while extremely interesting, would not have direct implications for “varying constants” within this framework since the rate of change of ϕ is not bounded below.

As an example we evaluate such bounds within Scenario 1, where the relevant scalar coupling is λ_X and the numerical constants are $K/c_1^2 \simeq 0.67$ and $K/c_2^2 \simeq 0.0011$. Thus for a hypothetical variation $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha \sim 10^{-16} y^{-1}$, we find that η should be at least 5×10^{-14} .

For Scenario 4, which is barely ruled out from the point of view of producing the claimed nonzero variations of α and μ , we find the larger values $K/c_1^2 \simeq 1.5$ and $K/c_2^2 \simeq 0.1$ reflecting the fact that such scenarios produce small μ variations through partial cancellation.

4.2 Bound on variation of $\bar{\phi}$ at earlier times

Equation (30) may also be extended to earlier times, given bounds on the energy content of the universe derived from cosmological measurements. Changing variables from time to redshift we find for the change in the scalar field value back to some redshift z

$$|\Delta \bar{\phi}| \leq \ln(1+z) \max \left(\sqrt{3\Omega_\phi(1+w_\phi)} \right) \quad (35)$$

³With an experiment using test bodies of very large Z , this contribution could become competitive or dominant.

where the maximum is to be evaluated over the range from z to the present. A very conservative bound is a scalar field behaving like cold dark matter, for which $w = 0$ and $\Omega \leq 0.35$, thus the square root is 1 or less. This leads to a limit such as $|\Delta\bar{\phi}| \leq 0.12$ at the Oklo epoch $z = 0.13$ (see the last reference of [8]), or $|\Delta\bar{\phi}| \leq 1.4$ at redshift 3. This justifies the previous assumption that $|\Delta\bar{\phi}|$ was at most of order 1 at redshifts relevant for QSO absorption spectra. We emphasize that in almost all viable scalar theories such values of $\Delta\bar{\phi}$ will be a considerable overestimate, since it would require considerable fine tuning to saturate these upper bounds on $\dot{\bar{\phi}}$ at all times.

In theories where the nonlinear dependence of coupling strengths on the canonically normalized scalar $\bar{\phi}$ is known, such results can be used to check consistency of measurements of α , μ and other quantities at different epochs. In general as stated earlier the dependence is allowed to be an arbitrary function of $\bar{\phi}$ and only the derivative at the current epoch is probed by WEP and atomic clocks.

5 Conclusions

We have investigated bounds arising from violations of the Weak Equivalence Principle in scalar field theories in which the proton-electron mass ratio μ may vary. We related such bounds to unified theories, astrophysical observations of quasar absorption spectra and atomic clock measurements of the constancy of physical parameters. Model-independent bounds on the rate of change of the scalar field and on its total variation at any given epoch are obtained from the effect of its kinetic energy on the expansion of the Universe.

For a given nonzero variation of μ , the scalar couplings to the proton or electron mass are bounded below, thus so is the resulting differential acceleration, up to a single parameter K/c_2^2 . This parameter is a ratio of scalar coupling constants, which arises from how the nucleon and electron masses are related in the underlying particle theory. Hence such underlying theories, in particular gauge unification at high energy, could be tested with variation of μ .

Since the value of α may also vary in such underlying theories, we also analyzed its variation in relation to WEP violation, extending previous works. We found that in many scenarios for generating varying μ from unified models, the differential acceleration parameter η is near or above its current experimental limit. In particular, in scenarios where due to cancellations the variation of μ is not much larger than that of α , the contributions to differential accelerations do not cancel and the violation of WEP is at or above the experimental limit. Thus it seems very difficult to reconcile currently claimed nonzero variations of μ and α within unified models.

Our results differ from those of [38], where the cosmological variation of μ was bounded to be many orders of magnitude below current levels of sensitivity. The main difference is that in [38] the source of the scalar field variation was taken to be the coupling to the local electron density, whereas we allow the field to be driven by a potential energy and in principle by couplings to other constituents of the Universe. This illustrates the point that in models where the

form of the scalar Lagrangian is known or assumed, more stringent bounds may be found. Our aim was however to find bounds which are as model-independent as possible.

Acknowledgments

Helpful discussions with C. Wetterich, M. Doran, M. Murphy, D. Mota and D. Shaw are acknowledged. The author is supported by the *Impuls- and Vernetzungsfond der Helmholtz-Gesellschaft*.

References

- [1] M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, J. K. Webb, V. V. Dzuba, J. X. Prochaska and A. M. Wolfe, Lect. Notes Phys. **648** (2004) 131 [astro-ph/0310318]; M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb and V. V. Flambaum, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **345** (2003) 609; M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum and S. J. Curran, Astrophys. Space Sci. **283** (2003) 577, Astrophys. Space Sci. **283** (2003) 565.
- [2] E. Reinhold, R. Buning, U. Hollenstein, A. Ivanchik, P. Petitjean and W. Ubachs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 151101; A. Ivanchik *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **440**, 45 (2005).
- [3] R. Srianand, H. Chand, P. Petitjean and B. Aracil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 121302 and Astron. Astrophys. **417** (2004) 853; H. Chand, P. Petitjean, R. Srianand and B. Aracil, astro-ph/0408200.
- [4] S. A. Levshakov *et al.*, astro-ph/0511765; S. A. Levshakov, M. Centurion, P. Molaro and S. D’Odorico, “VLT/UVES constraints on the cosmological variability of the fine-structure astro-ph/0408188.
- [5] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, M. J. Drinkwater, F. Combes and T. Wiklind, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **327** (2001) 1244.
- [6] P. Tzanavaris, J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum and S. J. Curran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 041301.
- [7] Y. Su, B. R. Heckel, E. G. Adelberger, J. Gundlach, M. Harris, G. L. Smith and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 3614; S. Baeßler, B. R. Heckel, E. G. Adelberger, J. Gundlach, U. Schmidt, and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 3585.
- [8] Y. V. Petrov, A. I. Nazarov, M. S. Onegin, V. Y. Petrov and E. G. Sakhnovsky, hep-ph/0506186; Y. Fujii *et al.*, hep-ph/0205206; T. Damour and F. Dyson, Nucl. Phys. B **480** (1996) 37.
- [9] K. A. Olive *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 045022 and Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 027701.
- [10] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, astro-ph/0603449.

- [11] P. Astier *et al.*, astro-ph/0510447. A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **607**, 665 (2004)
- [12] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302**, 668 (1988);
- [13] B. Ratra and P. J. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988);
- [14] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998).
- [15] G. R. Dvali and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 091303
- [16] J.D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **25** (1982) 1527; *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 123514.
- [17] K. A. Olive and M. Pospelov, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 085044.
- [18] L. Anchordoqui and H. Goldberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 083513.
- [19] D. Parkinson, B. A. Bassett and J. D. Barrow, *Phys. Lett. B* **578** (2004) 235.
- [20] M. Doran, *JCAP* **0504** (2005) 016 [astro-ph/0411606].
- [21] C. Wetterich, *JCAP* **0310** (2003) 002.
- [22] K. Nordtvedt, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **17** (2002) 2711; see also gr-qc/0212044.
- [23] B. A. Campbell and K. A. Olive, *Phys. Lett. B* **345** (1995) 429.
- [24] X. Calmet and H. Fritzsch, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **24** (2002) 639; *Phys. Lett. B* **540** (2002) 173; astro-ph/0605232.
- [25] P. Langacker, G. Segré and M. J. Strassler, *Phys. Lett. B* **528** (2002) 121 [hep-ph/0112233].
- [26] M. Dine, Y. Nir, G. Raz and T. Volansky, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 015009.
- [27] T. Dent and M. Fairbairn, *Nucl. Phys. B* **653** (2003) 256.
- [28] T. Dent, *Nucl. Phys. B* **677** (2004) 471; see also hep-ph/0305026.
- [29] V.V. Flambaum and E. V. Shuryak, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 103503.
- [30] V.F. Dmitriev and V. V. Flambaum, astro-ph/0209409.
- [31] For a recent review see C.M. Will, *Living Rev. Rel.* **4** (2001) 4; updated at gr-qc/0510072.
- [32] D.F. Mota and J.D. Barrow, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **349** (2004) 291; J.D. Barrow and D.F. Mota, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** (2003) 2045; J.D. Barrow and C. O’Toole, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **322** (2001) 585.

- [33] D. J. Shaw and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 123505; see also gr-qc/0512117.
- [34] J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 083520.
- [35] P. P. Avelino, C. J. A. Martins, J. Menezes and C. Santos, astro-ph/0512332.
- [36] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 171104 and Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 044026 P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A. C. Davis, J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 123518.
- [37] D. F. Mota and D. J. Shaw, hep-ph/0606204.
- [38] J. D. Barrow and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 043521.
- [39] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Rept. **87** (1982) 77.
- [40] E. B. Gregory *et al.*, hep-lat/0511048.